

## **REMARKS**

Applicants' representative would like to thank Examiner Edell for the courtesies extended during the interviews of April 12, 2006 and May 10, 2006. During the April Interview, the Examiner agreed that DeBrabant (U.S. Pat. No. 6,880,890) does not qualify as a reference under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e). DeBrabant has a filing date of February 5, 2004, for purposes of § 102(e). The present application properly claims priority to U.S. Provisional Patent Application No. 60/537,480, filed January 16, 2004, which is earlier in time than February 5, 2004 (DeBrabant's filing date for § 102(e) purposes). Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claim 23, as well as Claims 10-15 and 24-25, dependent therefrom, are in condition for allowance.

During the May Interview, Applicants' representative presented arguments to the Examiner that Miyashita fails to teach an adjustment mechanism having a lock member that selectively engages a cross-member of a first housing to selectively prevent rotation of a second housing. The Examiner agreed with the foregoing assertion, but required Applicants to further amend independent Claim 16 to define the lock member as being "spaced-apart from" the cross-member in the unlocked position to allow rotation of the second housing. Applicants have amended independent Claim 16 in accordance with the Examiner's suggestion and therefore respectfully submit that Claim 16, as well as Claims 17-22, dependent therefrom, are in condition for allowance.

Claims 10-25 are now pending in the application. By this paper, Claim 16 has been amended. The basis for this amendment can be found throughout the specification, claims, and drawings originally filed. No new matter has been added. The preceding amendment and the following remarks are believed to be fully

responsive to the outstanding Office Action and are believed to place the application in condition for allowance. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendment and remarks contained herein.

#### **REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 10, 15, and 23-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by DeBrabant (U.S. Pat. No. 6,880,890).

Claims 16-18, 21, and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Miyashita et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 4,641,884).

These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 23, as well as Claims 10-15 and 24-25, dependent therefrom, are in condition for allowance, as DeBrabant fails to qualify as a prior art reference under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e). Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

Independent Claim 16, as well as Claims 17-22, dependent therefrom, are believed to be in condition for allowance in light of the foregoing remarks. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

#### **REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 11 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over DeBrabant (U.S. Pat. No. 6,880,890) in view of Miyashita et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 4,641,884).

Claims 13 and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over DeBrabant (U.S. Pat. No. 6,880,890) in view of Robinson (U.S. Pat. No. 5,681,079).

Claims 19 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miyashita et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 4,641,884) in view of Robinson (U.S. Pat. No. 5,681,079).

These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Applicants note that the rejection of Claims 11-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is based on DeBrabant qualifying as a reference under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e). Because DeBrabant fails to qualify as a reference under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), as discussed above, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of Claims 11-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is improper. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

Independent Claim 16 is believed to be in condition for allowance in light of the foregoing remarks. Because Claims 19 and 20 depend from independent Claim 16, Claims 19 and 20 are similarly believed to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

## **CONCLUSION**

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office

Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: May 12, 2006

By: 

Michael Manizak  
Reg. No. 43,770  
Matthew H. Szalach  
Reg. No. 53,665

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.  
P.O. Box 828  
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303  
(248) 641-1600

MM/MHS/ca